



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

You point out in your ten objections that councils, federations, and courts backed by force have often been suggested by publicists during the past five centuries, but have never been seriously considered. Does that fact make you despair of success in trying a similar, though more limited, experiment, after Europe has been through the terrific experiences of the last thirteen months, and has been watching for fifty years the violent proceedings of an international law-breaker who believes that in practise Might makes Right?

I put together two of the sentences you print under the heading "Do You Realize?" namely: "The American Peace Society has been working for nearly a century to abolish wars" and "The greatest war of the ages is now devastating our world." Is it not a fair inference that the methods or policies of the American Peace Society have not been sound? Certainly failure of a long-pursued policy could not be more abject.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed)

CHARLES W. ELIOT.

THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

By JAMES BROWN SCOTT

The following self-explanatory letter is so vitally pertinent to the work of the American Peace Society that we are glad, with the consent of its author, to publish it in full.—THE EDITOR.

CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE,
2 JACKSON PLACE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 16, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. RALSTON:

At the conclusion of the very pleasant and profitable interview which we had yesterday about the future policy of the American Peace Society you were good enough to ask that I put into writing some of the views that I ventured to express concerning the policy which the American Peace Society might properly pursue.

I stated that it seemed to me best for the Peace Society, during the present war, to consider carefully its traditions, in order to determine whether, upon the conclusion of the war, if not before, it might take up those traditions and attempt to secure, if possible, their realization. When I speak of traditions, I mean more especially the views of William Ladd, the founder and later a president of the American Peace Society and author of "Essay on a Congress of Nations," published in 1840, which, in my opinion, is still the greatest literary contribution ever made to the cause of international peace; the views of William Jay, likewise a president of the American Peace Society, as expressed in his admirable little tractate entitled "War and Peace," published in 1842, and the views of Elihu Burritt, in essentials the views of Ladd, which Burritt set forth in various addresses to the European peace congresses which he called into being.

Now it is hard to give an adequate idea of Ladd's "Congress of Nations" without an analysis of the book, and it is difficult to obtain a copy of this work. Therefore I proposed, at the last meeting of our Executive Committee, held on May 21, to issue a new edition of this work, to be published by the Oxford Press and to be widely circulated. This proposal was approved, subject to the condition that I should prefix to the essay a biographical sketch and a statement of the relation of Ladd's work to the peace movement and to the Hague conferences, which he foresaw and outlined. This I agreed to do. I intend to propose later a new edition of William Jay's little work, and I hope that I may be able to get together a collection of Burritt's ad-

resses and articles which will justify their separate publication and distribution.

The reason for republishing these works is that they are in reality the head and front of the scientific and practicable peace movement.

Ladd proposed a Congress of Nations, as he foresaw the possibilities of international conferences to consider questions of international importance and to agree upon rules of conduct and of law to be adopted by the various states. He described in detail the work of such a diplomatic body as the Hague Conference; he stated how it was to be called, and he framed its program, and for many years to come the Hague Conferences will busy themselves with the topics suggested by Ladd.

In the next place, he advocated a Court of Nations to decide disputes, submitted voluntarily by the nations, in accordance with generally recognized principles of law and of equity. To future disputes the court was to apply the principles of international law or of international conduct drafted by the Congress of Nations and accepted by such nations as cared to be bound by them. Ladd had no illusions. He believed that the congress or conference of nations would do its work slowly, but he felt that this would be an advantage, as what was slowly done would not need to be done over again. He believed further that public opinion would force the nations to live up to their agreements, and that public opinion would likewise secure compliance with the judgments of the court. He was not an advocate of force, either to get the nations into court or to get them out of it.

Jay's little book proposed the *compromis* clause, to be embodied in treaties subsequently concluded by the United States, by which the contracting parties bound themselves to decide all disputes arising under these treaties by means of arbitration, and indeed to agree to decide all disputes between them by arbitration.

Burritt was the disciple of Ladd. He called into being unofficial congresses, presided over by men like Victor Hugo and Sir David Brewster, and which men like Richard Cobden attended. The outbreak of the Crimean War stopped his work. At these different conferences Mr. Burritt spoke of an international court and of the services which it would render.

Enough has been said to show that the American Peace Society has great traditions. It seems to me that it should call this fact to the attention of the public; that it should claim as its own the traditions of its

distinguished officers, for Ladd and Jay were presidents and Burritt was secretary of the American Peace Society. I do not mean by this that it should call attention to the views of its great men of the past, and, having done so, fold its arms and rest. I mean that the American Peace Society should take up the program of these men, that the American Peace Society should state this program as it was stated by them, and that the American Peace Society should show how the program as thus stated fits into the present day. The Society should not, however, content itself with an exposition of the views of the three men mentioned; it should develop their views and attempt to secure, as far as possible, acceptance of them today and their incorporation into the practice of nations.

I would venture to suggest that the work of the American Peace Society should be constructive, in the sense that it should seek by all practicable means to advance the cause of peaceable settlement, whether it be a settlement by good offices, mediation, friendly composition, commissions of inquiry, arbitration, or judicial decision. It should advocate the creation of agencies fitted to secure these different kinds of adjustment. It should endeavor to devise other methods of peaceable settlement and to suggest appropriate agencies for these newer methods. I think that better results would be reached in the long run by advocating this constructive policy than by indulging in the denunciation of concrete abuses, real or alleged. To be specific, I think that we do not make much progress by denouncing an increase of the army or navy, or by insisting upon a decrease of military and naval budgets. I admit that an increase of the army and navy and of military expenditures is to be regretted for many reasons, one of which is that, in our country at least, an increase may well mean a new danger known to the small circle of the well informed, but not to the public at large. In other countries an increase is largely a concession to militarism, which exists there but which, fortunately for us, does not exist in our country.

Now, my view is that societies and organizations other than the American Peace Society may be counted upon to oppose an increase of the army or navy and of military expenditures if the members of those societies or organizations believe that an increase of the land and naval forces and that an increase of military expenditures should be checked. Personally I have a feeling that, in the present condition of affairs, a larger army and a more efficient navy are needed by the United States for purely defensive purposes. At the same time, I believe that, even although the army and navy should be increased, we should strive to advance the cause of peaceful settlement, and to create agencies to compose differences peaceably, so that a public opinion may be formed so strongly in favor of peaceful adjustment that the resort to the army and navy for the decision of international disputes will become the rare exception, rather than the frequent rule.

I think that the peace movement owes it to itself to submit a substitute, or a series of substitutes, for a resort to arms. We have denounced the old fashioned method of force, and in my opinion we are right in denouncing it, but, having denounced it, I think the burden rests upon us of proposing other and more

adequate methods which shall have positive advantages of their own and few or none of the defects of the older system which we unsparingly condemn.

I have merely mentioned the army and navy as a concrete instance, and although it is apparently very inviting to take up the cudgels against the partisans of increased armament, I am deeply convinced that the American Peace Society should live up to its traditions, that it should develop them, and that it should leave to others that part of the peace movement which falls outside of those traditions. There will be a large task for the Peace Society if it consciously restricts itself to a definite program. It may not hope to cover the entire field. It will gain strength by concentration, and if it limits itself to constructive measures of the kind to be found in the plans of its great officers, it can hope to win the confidence of men of affairs, and thereby increase its standing and its influence in the community.

Now, I do not mean by this that other methods should be discouraged. The peace movement is like a stream, fed from many sources, but I think the wisest course for the American Peace Society is to withdraw within itself, as it were, during the present war, to consider carefully what can best be done in the future, to limit its program consciously, and, having so limited it, endeavor to carry it into effect when the conclusion of peace will give the Society a hearing.

It may, perhaps seem to you that some of the views which I have expressed are stated in the abstract, whereas what really interests people and influences them is the concrete. This is true to a certain extent, because I have not analyzed, and cannot within the short compass of a letter, analyze the views of Messrs. Ladd, Jay and Burritt. A careful reading of their works, however, will show that there is plenty of the concrete under the abstract.

I would not limit myself solely to the views of these great men. I would, as previously said, develop them as experience suggests that they should be developed or modified, and I would consciously start from these views. Having traditions, I would state what those traditions were, and at the same time I would indicate an intention to stand by them and to live up to them, and to endeavor to secure their realization in the practice of nations. It is because I believe that the traditions of the American Peace Society set it apart and give it a unique position in the peace movement, that I advocate a return to its traditions. Let other societies without those traditions follow their best judgment. Encourage and aid them to do so. But the American Peace Society should, in my opinion, go back to the Fathers, as it were, and consciously preach and carry out their doctrines to their logical conclusion. By so doing, the American Peace Society will occupy a very different position in the peace movement from that which it now occupies, and its influence will, I feel quite sure, be appreciably increased.

I have not mentioned the question of the reorganization of the Society, or changes to be made in the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*. These are very delicate and difficult questions, and require to be considered with great care and with no little patience. The reorganization of the Society depends largely upon the policy which it is

to pursue, and an agreement should be reached upon that policy before attempting a reorganization.

As regards the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, I believe it should be made a great and worthy organ of the peace movement as a whole, that it should be issued monthly, that it should be attractive in form and interesting in substance, that it should be edited by a person at an adequate salary, who would give his whole time to it, and that its policy should be controlled by a representative and competent board of editors. This is a matter which needs much thought and in which the experience of editors and managers of other periodicals is likely to be controlling.

I am not a member of the Board of Directors or of the Executive Committee of the American Peace Society, and I hesitate to make any suggestions at this

time concerning its reorganization. I am, however, deeply interested in its welfare and I would be willing to discuss it with you or with your committee, should you so desire. As regards the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, I should be glad to take up with you and your committee the changes which seem to be necessary to make it more representative of the peace movement and which are calculated to increase its circulation and its influence.

In the hope that I have not set forth my views on these subjects at too great length, I am, my dear Mr. Ralston,

Always sincerely yours,

(Signed)

JAMES BROWN SCOTT.

Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, Union Savings Bank Building, Washington, D. C.

NORTH AMERICA'S INTERNATIONAL EXPERIMENT

By Dr. J. A. MACDONALD

THE greatest thing North America has done, the thing which puts into visible and concrete form the spirit and purpose of this International Congress, is the joint achievement of these two nations, the United States and Canada. From the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Pacific across to the Arctic, there stretches an international boundary line of 4,000 miles, where territory touches territory, where sovereignty meets sovereignty, where nation salutes nation, but for a hundred years the international waters of those Great Lakes have been unfretted by any ship of war, those rolling prairies have been unmarked by any hostile fort, those majestic mountains have never echoed to the roar of any alien gun.

Four thousand miles! For one hundred years! Tell me, you men from other continents, where in all the world is there a match for this that North America has done? Where is there a civilization so undishonored? Where is there a boundary so free? Where is there a history so worthy of record? Let Europe answer.

Europe! from whom we inherited our civilization, whose two thousand years is our background, whose achievements were our inspiration. Europe! whose Christianity is in our creeds, whose culture is in our colleges, whose heart's-blood is in our veins! Europe! bristling with guns from the Hebrides to the Dardanelles, bleeding at every boundary with death-wound none can stanch—O Europe! how often would America have come to you with the gospel of international goodwill, teaching you the secret of Anglo-American peace, proving to you the power of international disarmament, and helping to gather your shattered nationalities into a United States of Europe! How often! But ye would not. Now, no matter who among you is to blame, we, too, must suffer in your agony. The national peace of this American Republic is threatened by your madness. The best red blood of the Canadian Dominion is being

soaked into your battlefields because of the blood-guiltiness of your sin.

But when this world-storm of Europe is past, when this red rain has enriched the roots of Europe's next verdure, the United States and Canada, their common democracy made stronger by their common experiences, shall come again into the council chamber of the nations, and, with the released democracies of the warring peoples of Europe, shall speak the doom of the autocrats and the despots and the war lords and all that damning system of militarism that has cursed Europe for two thousand years.

Before this world-war is over these two free democracies of North America shall have paid the price of war; it may be they shall have paid it in full, and it may be the United States as well as Canada shall have paid it in blood. And then, not the United States and Canada alone, but all the democratic nations the world over, shall have something to say to the war lords. And they will insist that the world is too small for war lords or for war; that in the world neighborhood of civilized nations there shall be no longer any room for the wild beasts of Europe's war jungle, and that the broken-down war-nationalisms of Europe shall give place to North America's international experiment.

And this is North America's prophetic vocation; this is the high calling wherewith North America is called; not any proud boasting that America is better than Europe, that "I am holier than thou," that our handbreadth of political history has nothing to learn from Europe's struggle through the ages. Not that.

North America at best is only Europe's second chance. The seeds of our harvests of liberty and peace were carried to our shores from the historic fields of Britain, from France, too, and the Netherlands, from the sunny slopes of Italy and the Alpine glens, from the shadows of Bohemia and the valley of the Rhine. We are the heirs of all the ages. The fagots of Europe's martyrdoms kindled the fires of liberty for us. It is not for us to boast. Rather must we heed the prophet call, and share with Europe, man with man and nation with nation, the infinite tragedy of this time.